

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC HERALD

VOL. II. No. 45

CHICAGO, ILL., U. S. A., SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1900.

Whole No. 95.

UNION CONTROVERSY CONTINUED

Amalgamation a Mistake

Editor of The Herald: I am glad to see, and so are a good many comrades in New York, that the conference has succeeded in greatly reducing the enthusiasm of many comrades all over the country for unity. If the conference has demonstrated anything it is that the S. L. P. faction did not want an honorable alliance with the S. D. P., but a complete swallowing up of our party. What was the conference, if not a meeting to endorse everything that was passed by the Rochester convention and to undo everything that was built up by a few years of hard toil first by the S. D. A. and later by the S. D. P. The S. D. P. never boasted of being a class conscious, proletarian, scientific Marxian party in the DeLeon or the "Volkszeitung" sense of the word. We never inquired whether our agitators are well versed in the three volumes of Marx and all their commentaries or not, and we never cared to examine through a microscope the speeches of Eugene Debs to see whether he did not in some enthusiastic plea for Socialism commit an error in his definitions of some economic terms, as capital, wages, etc. We were even so liberal as to raise the question of a farmer's plank, in spite of the fact that a farmer does not properly belong to our class-conscious proletarian class. All these traits of the S. D. P. are regarded by our new S. L. P. comrades as symptoms of "muddle-headedness," and in case of amalgamation they would certainly view it as their sacred mission to purify the S. D. P. from all its old traditions. That all this is true was more than demonstrated by the conference, where they also gave us a taste of those "constitutional" measures by which their mission will be carried out. Now it is a fact that these two parties still differ in their spirit, and this difference can not be so easily wiped out by a mere decision to amalgamate. I don't after all blame the S. L. P. representatives for their attempt to swallow the S. D. P.; there was simply more shrewdness on their part, and as a result they succeeded in the game, and not we; the result would be otherwise under opposite circumstances. The trouble, it seems to me, lies in the original idea of amalgamating two things which do not lean toward each other, neither in spirit nor in mutual sympathy.

But some sort of unity is certainly wanted, and the problem is to find some way of working together so as to reap all the benefits of combination and avoid all the disadvantages connected with a premature amalgamation. And in this our European comrades could give us, as in many other things, very useful hints. Look at the Socialists in France, where unity certainly was of much greater importance than here. The Socialists there could not very well stand separated in factions, while Socialism became so strong as to compel the government to give a Socialist leader a place in the cabinet. And still did the French Socialists amalgamate? Certainly not. They simply combined for the purpose of common action, leaving the integrity of the different Socialist organizations untouched. All they did is the election of a joint executive board, but each organization retains its identity, its membership, its newspapers, its policy, as before. In course of time a perfect amalgamation will probably take place, but this will be a natural union and not an "automatic coupling," accomplished by a stroke of the pen. Exactly the same we see in England. At a recent conference a united labor party was organized composed of trade unions of the S. D. F., S. L. P. and the Fabian Society. And here again we see a co-operation and not an amalgamation, its sole purpose being to work together in political campaigns. The S. D. F. remains the S. D. F., the S. L. P. remains what it was before and so does the Fabian Society and the trade unions. None of them would ever consent to give up its identity. Every one of them has its own policy, its own spirit, its own history and traditions, and it justly desires to keep up its individuality. The union was brought about for such purposes, where unity is absolutely indispensable, namely, for political action and no more.

Now, why should not the S. D. P. and the S. L. P. faction unite on the same lines? This is to my mind the only way in which an effective, healthy union could be accomplished. Not amalgamation, but co-operation. Let Debs and Harriman run on the same ticket, though belonging to different organizations; let us begin to practice the same policy of combining with the S. L. P. during campaigns everywhere and we may expect a real genuine union to grow out in course of time and not an artificial fusion with mistrust at its very birth. It is never too late and I would urgently recommend the Executive Committee to set to work at once and to devise some practical plan by which such co-operation could be brought about even for the

coming campaign, and I am confident that a co-operation on these lines will be much more acceptable to a good many members of the S. D. P. than the scheme prepared by the conference.

S. Peskin, M. D.

New York.

Hayes' Letter Settled Him

Dear Comrades: I am one of the common herd, but I want to tell you of my feelings the past week when I read the manifesto of the executive board. I was much depressed; then I grew indignant. Why had they acted so quickly. They were hot. Why not cool off and then if need be, act? Why not let us wait and discuss the committee report, and then, if it seems best, vote that down? Then the thought would come that perhaps they were right after all. For a week I wavered—first one side then the other. Then came the Herald for April 14. The first thing I read was Max Hayes' reply, and it was enough. I did not need to read MacCartney's able presentation of the case. Hayes' letter settled me. There is one thing that especially struck me among the other self-accusations. He says: "When the name question was being discussed in New York I attended the weekly meeting of the Central Federated Union and addressed that body." Why, Mr. Hayes, were you not sent as a delegate to the committee on unification? Was it not your duty to be there? It was not for you just then to be attempting to make a few more converts. Surely there were other Socialists who could have done that. What if the other seventeen had also gone about speaking at meetings. Mr. Hayes, your place was at the unification meeting and no amount of circumlocution can cover it up. I am for the Social Democratic Party as it is.

Mendon, Mass. W. E. Dixon.

For Socialist Unity

Comrade Socialists: The manifesto issued by the National Executive Board of the Social Democratic Party and published in the Social Democratic Herald of April 7, 1900, justifies an expression of opinion on our part, as well as on the part of all other organized Socialists, and because of that we feel it to be our duty as a portion of the Social Democratic Party to issue this circular.

We have read this manifesto with unfeigned regret and surprise. It was our hope that the plans inaugurated by the Rochester and Indianapolis conventions and practically consummated at the conference on socialist union held at New York would have reached completion harmoniously and satisfactorily. It was apparent to every one that the time had come for the union of Socialist forces and necessity demanded that such a union should be accomplished in order that the cause of Socialism should be advanced and accelerated. In view of existing conditions we therefore hold:

First. That union is a necessity. Second. That the overwhelming sentiment among Socialists for union demanded that such union be accomplished as speedily and equitably as possible. Third. That the negotiations for union should be conducted regardless of the acts or wishes of any individual.

The action of the National Executive Board of the Social Democratic Party has presented a new phase in the situation and it is our purpose to outline what in our opinion is the best course for all Socialists interested to pursue in the premises.

The manifesto in question charges that the Social Democratic committee on union violated their instructions in failing to preserve the right of a concurrent vote on the question of party name, and also that certain members of the Socialist Labor Party committee on union failed to fulfill pledges said to have been given at an informal meeting of certain delegates held at Indianapolis during the convention. In answer to the first charge we call attention to the fact that the members of both parties, in case of a failure to decide upon one of the two names by concurrent vote, have the choice of declaring whether or not they will accept that name which receives a majority of the total votes cast on the question of name. This proposition also requires a concurrent vote, thus leaving the entire matter in the hands of the membership of both parties. Consequently the first charge falls to the ground.

In reply to the second charge we insist that the failure of individuals to fulfill pledges, even if made, is not sufficient reason to prevent a union of those wishing for the inauguration of Socialism. It will be plain that if any conference was held as recorded such conference was entirely unofficial, and for the National Executive Board to base their action against union, upon the results of that conference is unjusti-

fiable, because any action taken by the conference was a usurpation of power and not binding upon either party.

And while we deny the right of the National Executive Board to submit such a proposition as embodied in their manifesto, yet taking all the circumstances apparent at this time into account, and also realizing our inability to fully state our position we urge and call upon the members of the Social Democratic Party, not in our name, but in the name of the working class movement for Socialism, to vote "Yes" upon the proposition submitted by the National Executive Board in their manifesto, believing this action will best avert the destination of a unified movement.

Further, we call upon the members of the Socialist Democratic Party and the Socialist Labor Party to vote for the name "Social Democratic" as the name of the united party and also in favor of the other propositions submitted by the joint committee on union, to the end that unity may be effected. Believing it to be the purpose of the present National Executive Board to maintain a separate organization, we therefore urge upon the members of both parties the distinct necessity of voting for the name "Social Democratic" as the name of the united party, so that such purpose of the board if attempted in case the name "Social Democratic" is not adopted, be prevented. By voting for the name "Social Democratic" you will prevent the use of the name unduly, and thus facilitate the transfer of the control of the Social Democratic party into the hands of the provisional committee of the united party. Prompt and decisive action is necessary at this critical period and we trust every socialist will act with but the best of interests of the great cause of Socialism as his guide.

C. A. FRASER,

Chairman.

GEORGE A. KEENE,

Secretary.

Massachusetts Branch No. 16.
Haverhill, Mass.

The Party Press Arrangement

Comrades:—I have already criticized the press arrangement submitted by the conference committee, but want to add another word on a phase of it that has since come to my knowledge.

At the conference I opposed the selection of Springfield, Mass., as the seat of the National Executive Board for various reasons. One of them was that if the local Socialist paper which the Springfield anti-DeLeonites publish and support was in any way a reflection of their views and their general make-up, as would naturally be the case, they were not exactly the kind of people to direct the affairs of a party of which the Social Democrats were to form a component part. At this point I was interrupted by a member of our own committee, and was told that the Proletarian, the paper to which I had reference, was practically dead, and its editor was discredited among his own kind, not recognized by them. An S. L. P. delegate volunteered the information that the editor, whose name is Spelman, was now supposed to be with the De Leonites; and all the rest of the S. L. P.s, sitting around, looked on and listened, and by silence gave consent. Upon the above assurances I dropped that point, and went on to another.

That you may know the ground of my objection to the Proletarian, I quote from its issue of Nov. 19, 1899, which I happen to have by me, as a specimen of what the able editor can do when he tries:

"A liar himself, this old buck, master of bastard English, father of socialist liars, editor of Kuhn's People, Daniel De Leon, struts at the head of a contingent of skulking, cringing, fawning frightened followers. For these latter we have much pity. They are dupes; they are stupid; they are hypnotized. Do not charge us with using abusive language, Messrs. Skunks; we have simply picked up a few of your terms, by the way. You think you like a scrap. We enjoy it better than you, when we find it a necessity. Gentlemen of the S. L. P., it is necessary to get out on a skunk hunt."

Now, I don't want to criticize the editor of the Proletarian. For those who like that sort of thing, his style is all right. In fact, I frankly acknowledge that, for its kind, it can hardly be surpassed. I merely say that it is not our kind; and I believe most Social Democrats will agree with me.

Well, as I said before, upon the assurances given me that the Proletarian was practically dead, and its editor not recognized by the Kangaroos, I allowed the matter to drop.

I had to leave the conference before it adjourned, in order to catch my train for Boston, but left three of our committee, Comrades Carey, Hoehn and Butscher, together with the entire committee of the S. L. P., to settle up a few minor details of the constitution. They settled up these matters, and, I find, also took up and decided the exceedingly

MORE BENHAM (S.L.P.) VENOM

The Workers' Call prints the letter of Benham, which appeared in this paper, but with the following additional proof of high moral principle from a genuine S. L. P. source; he inserts this in copy sent to papers with the indelible S. L. P. brand:

"Incidentally, would it not be very advantageous for the Republican party to have as many Democratic parties in the field as possible? And might not the Republican party so 'interest' the four signers of the manifesto that they would make the stand they have for 'Democratic' as against anything and everything? Whoop'er up for union!"

important question of which papers should be placed upon the list of official organs and receive the support of the National Executive Committee. Six papers were selected by the joint committee, and among the six, as you will see, comrades, by the majority report, is the Proletarian!

How is that for "good faith?" Is that fair and honorable treatment for me, I ask? I cannot keep silent upon this matter. It is an outrage that it should be given out as the best judgment of the joint committee that the Proletarian should be endorsed as an official organ of the united parties, receive the support of the National Executive Committee, and be placed upon precisely the same footing as our Herald, which, whatever else it may not be, is at least clean. It matters comparatively little what private enterprise papers may say, even though they may call themselves Socialists; but, for the utterances of an official organ, the party itself is properly held responsible. And of all the six papers on the list the Proletarian, being published at the proposed seat of the N. E. C., will be most generally recognized as the special mouthpiece of the party. Are you willing, comrades, to be held responsible for all the possible utterances of the author of the above quotation? I, for one, am not.

Another criticism I have to offer of the list submitted, is that it contains no German paper. We have lots of good German comrades, and at least three good German papers, any one of which might have been put upon the list. Many of the German comrades have already complained that the S. D. Herald is of little use to them as they read it with much difficulty, and have requested that arrangements be made whereby they could have a German paper instead. This would have been a good opportunity to make such an arrangement.

But what does it matter? The whole scheme is wrong. And as I expected, our membership is not satisfied with it. A letter from Maine, received this morning, among many others of a similar tone, says: "We would rather yield every other point, even the location of the national headquarters, and if necessary the party name, rather than not to have the Herald as our official organ and sent to the membership free. We believe this to be the strongest feature of the organization. Every member getting the paper, it keeps all in touch with the spirit of the party. I think this feature has been a very strong factor in building up the party to its present standing." To which I heartily subscribe.

I believe that the press plan, submitted by the joint committee, should be rejected, and the committee instructed to devise and submit a better one.

MARGARET HAILE.

Reject the Majority Report

Editor of The Herald: Let no comrade be disheartened because of the action of the New York conference. The principles of Socialism are founded upon the eternal rock of justice and they will endure. The petty bickerings of individuals can in no way affect their truth. The Social Democratic party is built upon those principles, Justice, purity, truth and progress have been its watchwords from the day of its organization down to the present time. We have started at zero and in twenty months have made our party a power in the country. We have done this not only without the assistance, in any way, of the S. L. P., but in most instances IN SPITE OF THEIR ACTIVE OPPOSITION.

We have made the party in spite of them; surely we can continue it without them.

We are on the eve of success; why should we feel disheartened? The work of the conference committee is unsatisfactory in almost every respect and it should be rejected. Time, the great peace-maker, settles all disputes; and the day is not far distant when there will be but one Socialist party in all this land, and that will be the Social Democratic party of America.

But let us in discussing these things remember that this is not a time for accusations and recriminations. It matters not what Hillquit or Hayes or Benham or any other man may have promised or have said; it is what has been done that counts, and our discussion should be limited to that. Let us not be

too hasty to condemn but rather let us never forget that we are comrades in the most glorious struggle for liberty and justice that the world has ever known. Courage, a cool head, and a perfect loyalty are the prime necessities of the hour. A month from now our passions will have cooled and many of the things which now appear as mountains will not even make molehills then. Let every comrade stand loyal to the party and wait. And may the spirit and wisdom pervade our councils and help us to know the right, is the prayer of
Evansville, Ind. C. W. Hewitt.

Conference Report Repudiated

Comrades of the Social Democratic Party: The members of the Social Democratic party demand the right to vote as a party on the propositions of the committee on unity that were authorized by the convention.

It is their privilege and right to initiate freely such amendments as they desire shall be submitted with the report of said committee. The national executive, consisting of Eugene V. Debs, Victor L. Berger, Jesse Cox, Seymour Steadman and Frederick Heath, is still in power and authority, and will be until by referendum the members of the party declare for unity and elect other members of a national committee to succeed them.

The Social Democratic Party has aroused the dormant hatred of oppression and tyranny that is the heritage of each true American citizen. We want this to continue and only those thoroughly imbued with the American spirit can continue the task.

While we yield to no one in respect, love and admiration for the Socialists who have borne the heat and burden of the days that are gone, we yet insist that this aroused American sentiment cannot be led properly by the eastern members fresh from the imbroglíos, sharp practices and club-using of the past few years.

Our movement is great enough to be truly representative. A few men in a restricted locality, circumscribed by condition and their sectionalism, cannot look after a national movement. Let us profit by the mistakes of the past. A national committee formed and controlled by a small section is a gigantic mistake.

We, therefore, members of the Social Democratic party contained in branches Nos. 1 and 4 of New Jersey initiate the following amendments to the committee's report and call upon branches in five states to second our amendments that the national executive committee may submit them together with the majority report of the unity committee to the referendum of the party:

First—That the headquarters of the national committee shall be in Chicago, Ill.

Second—That one member from each state and territory shall constitute the national committee. Each state to send its delegates to the national committee meeting at its own expense. Seven members to constitute a quorum at a called meeting and a total vote of twenty-five necessary to settle a question submitted by mail. Any state may be represented by proxy.

Third—We deplore the failure of the understanding which contemplated and pledged support from the "unnamed" Socialists for the name "Social Democratic party."

The name selected as a substitute is most unfortunate. There is not now nor perhaps ever will be a "united" Socialist party. The name is a sham, a piece of cheap brag, an air bubble. It breathes an atmosphere out of which we had graduated.

We were willing to leave the question of name to a referendum if an honest endeavor was made to get the sense of the members that desired to join us, but the secrecy thrown around the members and organization of the S. L. P. and their action in the committee on union make us lose confidence. Inasmuch as the resolution submitted by the committee on union No. 3 which reads: "In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority of both parties shall the name that receives the majority of the total vote of both parties be adopted" contravenes the resolutions submitted and carried at the Indianapolis convention, we demand that the national executive committee shall rule it out of the referendum and not submit it to the voters.

We are glad that the national executive committee seeks an expression of the members of the party on unity. The members of our branches are in favor of unity, but we want to safeguard the interests and principles which led to our separate organization two years ago.

Michael W. Schon,
Edward C. Wind,
Secretaries of Newark, N. J., Branches.

A Social Democratic ticket at Fari-bault, Minn., was supported at the polls by 600 voters, causing a genuine surprise in the town.

Social Democratic Herald

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY THE
SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AMERICA

Executive Board
JESSE COX, Chairman
SEYMOUR STEDMAN, Secretary
EUGENE V. DEBS, VICTOR L. BERGER
FREDERIC HEATH

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—One year, \$0 cents. Six months, 25 cents. No papers sent to any one on credit. If, without having subscribed, you receive it, then it has been subscribed for by a friend and no bill will follow. Foreign subscriptions \$1.00.

Entered at Chicago postoffice as second class matter.

A. S. EDWARDS, Editor
THEODORE DEBS, National Sec'y-Treas.
126 Washington St., Chicago.

95 is the number of this paper. If the number on your wrapper is 96 your subscription expires with the next week's paper. Please renew promptly.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APR. 28, 1900.

CONDENSED OPINIONS

So many communications have been received by The Herald on the subject of unity and its various incidents, that, while it has been our desire to print them entire, their number and length makes this impossible. We give complete more than a dozen letters in this paper on both sides of the controversy; others have been necessarily condensed to a brief statement of the writer's position for or against the attitude of the executive body or the matter of unity, as follows:

Geo. A. Gowdy, Bristol, Conn.: "Let us accept the referendum of the New York conference just as it is proposed. By it we can accomplish union. After union is accomplished we can have more referendums if we are not satisfied with our condition."

Branch 2, Erie, Pa., instructed its secretary to formulate charges against the executive board and voted in favor of the union.

Branch 5, Philadelphia, indorses the attitude of the executive board, but expressly declares the necessity for union.

East Side Branch, New York, adopted resolutions expressing full confidence in the board.

Branch 3, New York, passed resolutions condemning the action of the executive board and favoring union.

F. M. McQuivey, Eureka, Utah: "The S. D. P. is a movement; the S. L. P. bolters a sect—yes, only a part of a sect. I am for union—when the time comes for it."

W. G. Markland, Sherwood, Tenn.: "After digesting the action of the Indianapolis convention and of the union conference, at New York, I am compelled to believe that there was violation of good faith and pledges, in spirit and in fact."

Julius A. Martin, secretary Branch 1, Ardmore, I. T.: "Our branch will send in an official vote; it will be no—no—no."

The branch at Seattle, Wash., sends in long resolutions denunciatory of the executive board.

A. D. Stone, St. Louis, is opposed to the board's attitude.

Branch 4, Chicago, is solid against union and in support of the executive board. This is practically true of all branches in Chicago, where the "Big Four" are known.

Branch 9, Brockton, Mass., supports the action of the executive board, along with Illinois, New York, Wisconsin, Indiana, Kentucky, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Maine and almost the entire West. Sober second thought has saved before; it will save the Social Democratic party.

"Merlin," after getting a line on all the facts, writes: "I am unqualifiedly in favor of no union. Don't get discouraged. This is only a stone under the wheel. It may shake, but cannot stop the wagon of progress. The S. D. name and spirit shall conquer."

The vote secured by Comrade Bruell of Pana, Ill., who was the Social Democratic candidate for alderman from the Fourth ward, gives the party a place on the official ballot next year. His vote was 46 against 54 for the democrat and 74 for the republican.

Trades unionists will be consulting their own interests and helping their own cause by giving the special trades union edition of the Appeal to Reason the widest circulation possible. Every union should order a big bundle to distribute among non-union workers.

Job Harriman has been appointed state organizer of the united party for New York. This was done at a meeting at the Labor Lyceum, New York city, April 9, by the two state committees.

The official returns of the recent municipal election at Milwaukee give the Social Democrats the following votes: Heath, 2,584; Hinz, 2,681; Tuttle, 2,749.

The city central committee of Chicago has voted unanimously to indorse the position of the executive board.

Socialism in a Little Box

Comrades: For a long time the Socialist Labor Party tried to keep Socialism shut up in a little box, which was watched by a holy guard, and on certain occasions, if one furnished the required credentials, the lid of the box was lifted and he was allowed a whiff from the inside. The qualifications entitling one to this privilege were, generally speaking, inability to speak English, lack of good clothes and proximity to New York city. Deficiency in any one of these qualifications had to be made up by excess in one of the others.

As Socialists became more numerous in spite of the guarded box, another protecting circle was reached and a detective cordon was organized, one or two members of which were in each center of Socialistic thought. These detectives were furnished with a measure, and all who joined the party were either stretched out or lopped off to fit the measure. At last a revolt took place in the ranks and the holy guard was despoiled of the box.

Those who were not fortunate enough to attend the S. D. P. convention at Indianapolis can not fully appreciate the happy fraternalism characteristic of that assemblage. The joy of meeting comrades known only through correspondence and reputation, the intense desire to act wisely, the earnest wish to unite all Socialists of the United States were uppermost in the minds of all. In that spirit the committee on union was elected. When that committee met the corresponding committee from the S. L. P. it developed that the pledge of good faith given to our comrades had been given to allay our fears and throw our committee off its guard. In place of a desire to unite Socialists and best promote Socialism, it was expected to bargain for such a union of party machine as would best control the Socialist movement. Instead of a fraternal conference of workers in the same cause, it was expected to treat pro and con for the guardianship of the little box.

Comrades, Socialism is like air and sunshine; it is a glorious fact, free to all, good or bad, just or unjust. The mists of ignorance obscure it, but it is always there. Any attempt to shut it up develops the poison of exclusiveness. The S. D. P. cannot assimilate that poison.

We have an organization that is growing, an executive who have done well, a paper clean and free from malice, headquarters in the storm center of the revolution, all these have been rejected by the committee of the S. L. P.

They have only left us our candidate, and his worth and popularity is relied on to break up completely the very party we have builded.

We cannot consent to this. Let us stand together. Let us say to all Socialists, "Come and help us push the standard of Socialism as high as possible during the coming campaign. Give us your personal strength and help for the coming battle and then let us meet again and try to understand each other." By that time the little box may be lost.
Corinne S. Brown.

Artificial Union Not Wanted

"The mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse." The scheme for political union which has been industriously boomed and exploited for six months has brought forth its first-born, and behold it is a misshapen monstrosity of discord and strife.

Perhaps this result was necessary in order to show some of our comrades who had almost gone daft over this scheme, the utter folly of attempting to patch up an artificial union without first securing organic unity.

Whatever the merits of the present controversy, there can be no doubt that the plan finally degenerated into an ordinary political dicker and trade. The goods were not delivered as promised, and as a result criminations and recriminations, charges of broken pledges and double-dealing are flying thick and fast. All this in the name of socialist unity. Like the fellow who was bound to have peace if he had to fight for it, they have forced a scheme for union upon us to the very verge of disunion in our own party.

Do we need any further demonstration of the utter folly of pursuing such a course in such a spirit any further? A lathwork aggregation of political parties without organic unity always has and always will be a farce and a failure. Socialist parties are no exception to this rule. We have learned a lesson. Let us now call a halt and take our bearings. We have been chasing this will-o'-the-wisp of socialist unity till we find ourselves floundering in the quagmire of party discord and disruption.

Our first duty is to our own party. No Social Democrat and no Socialist worthy of the name will seek union at the expense of disunion in our own ranks, now that the danger is apparent. The man who persists in pushing a scheme for so-called unity in the face of imminent disruption has no right to call himself a unionist.

The man who in this emergency dares to foment the spirit of discord is not a harmonizer. The man who says that those opposed to his pet scheme must be "kicked out," and that the next fight on Socialism must be to DRIVE OUT the "lawyers, doctors and ministers," such a man is "stealing the livery

of heaven to serve the devil in," for under the guise of a revolutionist he is acting the part of a reactionist, and under the guise of unity he is creating discord!

A crisis is upon us, and the supreme duty is to work for peace and harmony within our own ranks first of all, and to preserve intact the name and integrity of the Social Democratic Party. This, as I understand it, is the attitude of our national executive, and in it they should receive our fullest support. They could do no less and be loyal to their trust.

Does this mean that the cause of Socialist unity must be side-tracked and the sincere men and women who are looking and longing for a welding of Socialist forces must consider themselves enemies and be kept apart? Not at all. The absurdity and failure of the present attempt has only made apparent the necessity for organic unity. The present trouble has sprung entirely from the fact that those who were booming political union began at the wrong end. They attempted to stand their pyramid on its apex, and behold! it has toppled over almost before it was built. Now let the comrades of the S. L. P. and the S. D. P. who sincerely desire true organic unity, go to work first to secure harmony in their own ranks, then between their respective local branches, and out of this will grow organic unity which will inevitably find expression in state and national organizations. The pyramid will then stand on its base.

In view of the present crisis the cause of genuine unity can best be served by voting no in the proposition submitted by our national executive, throwing aside this artificial patchwork of the conference committee and then going to work in our local branches, to bring about harmony in our own ranks and unity with the S. L. P. If we proceed in this spirit and by these methods the longest way round will prove the shortest way home and in the end we shall secure genuine and lasting unity of Socialist forces.

H. A. Gibbs, M. D.
Worcester, Mass.

Milwaukee City Committee

The central committee of the S. D. P. of the city of Milwaukee assembled at a regular meeting on the 9th of April, 1900, and discussed fully the pending problem of the proposed union of forces of one of the factions of the S. L. P. and the S. D. P., and arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The deliberate repudiation by the representatives of the S. L. P. of their own pledge, solemnly given by them at the Indianapolis conference, in New York, show plainly that the leaders of that party do not act in good faith and entertain a scheme to simply absorb the S. D. P. under the pretext of union.

2. The delegation of the S. D. P., by agreeing in New York to the reopening of the discussion as to the name of the united parties and to the submission to the referendum vote two names jointly by the S. L. P. and S. D. P., in direct violation of the understanding arrived at at the Indianapolis convention, clearly acted in a grossly inconsistent manner, being swayed by the Machievian tactics of the S. L. P. leaders.

3. The union of the S. D. P. with the S. L. P. as an organization would be, under the present circumstances, simply suicide.

4. Every Socialist who subscribes to the principles and tactics of the S. D. P. is fraternally welcome to join the rank and file of the members of the S. D. P.

5. The young and hopeful S. D. P. ought not to be burdened by the fatal mistakes, gross blunders and extreme unpopularity of the S. L. P.

In view of this and other considerations the central committee of the Milwaukee members of the S. D. P. herewith heartily endorse the manifesto issued by the National Central Board of the S. D. P. and embraces the opportunity of expressing itself unanimously and unequivocally against any union or fusion with the S. L. P. as an organization at the present time and under the present conditions.

For the committee,

Eugene Rooney,

Secretary.

I. Ladoff,

F. W. Rehfeld,

Ed. Ziegler.

Milwaukee, Wis.

Montana, Attention!

In spite of statements made by interested parties that there will be no "Debs ticket" in the field, the Social Democratic club of Butte wishes to announce that there will positively be a Socialist ticket in the field at next fall's election. We appeal to all Socialists in the state to push the work of organization and propaganda. For literature and information in regard to the movement in this state,

Address Social Democratic Branch, 71 East Park street, Butte, Mont.

Comrade G. H. Strobell writes: "I'm with the national executive board in opposition to the practices of these extremists."

Social Democrats of Terre Haute have adopted a ringing municipal platform and nominated J. A. Hatchell, J. E. Wall and J. S. Kingery as candidates for councilmen at large.

Branch No. 18, Newburyport, Mass.

Believing; 1. That the consummation of a harmonious and effective union of Socialist forces is, on general principles, a matter of supreme importance; that at present it seems most desirable; and that such union would undoubtedly strengthen and stimulate the Socialist movement;

2. That the spirit of calm deliberation, frank and fraternal discussion, and a thorough knowledge of every side of debated questions, are necessary to a proper understanding and settlement of the same;

3. That it is most desirable to develop a spirit of faith in each other and in the movement; while, on the contrary, the arousing of the spirit of distrust, and denunciation of individuals, is harmful and disruptive;

4. That, while the party name is not of chief importance, it should nevertheless clearly express the object for which all true Socialists are striving, and at the same time should avoid the possibility of confusion with other party names and principles, or danger of variance with the truth; and

5. That the very essence of Socialism is based upon the expressed wish and will of all concerned;

Therefore, it is the resolution of Branch No. 18, Newburyport, Mass.,

1. That every possible honest means should be used for the consummation of a harmonious union between the Socialist Labor party and the Social Democratic party, avoiding even the appearance of any desire or effort on the part of one party to absorb or control the other, but exhibiting every willingness to make mutual concessions in the interests of the one great end in view;

2. That, though it can readily be understood that undue haste may easily arise from great zeal for the cause, yet such haste is to be regretted, especially where it leads to recriminations and reflections upon comrades of either party who have undoubtedly sacrificed for the same cause, and who give large evidence of an honest desire to continue doing their utmost in its behalf;

3. That ample time and opportunity should be given for the fullest and freest discussion and expression of opinion in the national organ, but that unpleasant personalities and recriminations should be avoided;

4. That the joint committee on union is entitled to the gratitude of all comrades for the time and attention thus far given to the duties for which it was appointed; that its present report be accepted as a report of progress; and that further time be given it for the formulation of a program for union, giving the largest rational latitude to the rank and file in deciding the party name, location of headquarters for the national executive committee, and all other matters which shall be submitted to the branches for referendum vote.

W. P. Porter,

C. W. Johnson,

T. H. Chisnall,

Committee on Resolutions.

Suggestion From Boston

The following resolution was adopted at a meeting of the Boston city committee S. D. P., held April 17:

"We recognize that the present discord in our party on the matter of Socialist unity is due to the intent of none but to the mistakes of many. We deny the necessity of placing the blame or imputing the motives of any, and declare our confidence in the integrity of all parties concerned.

"In the interest of harmony we urge the National Executive Board to recall their manifesto and referendum and leave the proposition submitted by the conference committee to the judgment of the membership of the party.

Signed: Affirmative: M. J. Konikow, S. E. Putney, A. McDonald, Bra. 1; C. W. White, Bra. 4; J. Spero, A. Segal, Bra. 15; T. H. Goetz, Bra. 44; H. H. Goodwin, F. S. Schmidt, Bra. 45; J. Ryan, Bra. 53.

Negative: A. C. Mendall, Bra. 29.

I was absent from the meeting because of illness. Should have signed the affirmative list had I been present.

JOHN WEAVER SHERMAN,

Secretary.

Boston, Mass.

Another View From Brooklyn

Comrades:—Four of our comrades by a usurpation of authority and obvious misrepresentation of facts dare interfere in the progress of Socialism on the eve of a union of the two Socialist parties of America.

There is no use threshing our well-known facts. As intelligent men and women, as Socialists, we must realize them. We must have observed and we must acknowledge that, as a whole, the S. L. P. has acted much more fairly in the unity negotiations than the S. D. P., not that our comrades have not done nobly in the great majority, but that the less than manly conduct of some S. D. P. comrades has dragged our side in the mud. As we foolishly gave them voice in our party management so must we witness the besmirching of our party's name and fame.

It was well that Comrade Eugene Debs should have been elected a member of the S. D. P. Executive Committee. But to aid him in directing the affairs of a party representing the most

glorious of causes whom did we choose?

They and their qualifications are: Comrade Victor Berger, who has continually vilified in his paper earnest Socialist workers; who, by so doing, stamps himself as prejudiced and unqualified to act in an executive capacity; who wrote in his paper when he said he had influenced Comrade Debs to accept the nomination; Comrade Heath, who has said that the S. L. P. comrades were of another kind altogether from himself and the S. D. P.; Comrade Jesse Cox, who has said he did not want anything whatever to do with the S. L. P. comrades; and Comrade Seymour Stedman, who is noted for being unable to keep his head.

Shall we let these men now prevent us from boarding the same ship with our brethren and sailing toward the shores of the co-operative commonwealth? They are willing to sail, too, for that shore; as such we know their intelligence and honesty of purpose; but as they desire to ride in their own vessel that they may stand at the helm and feel that their individual selves have not been contaminated by contact with those in the other craft, we despise their narrowmindedness and uselessness.

We of the rank and file want unity. We know that every single objection to it has arisen through some of our leaders: At least four of them, and, apparently, Comrades McCartney and Haile do not favor it. Shall we allow six comrades to sway us from the loftiest purpose we could at present hold? Most important of all things now is unity. More important than the name or tactics or constitution or propaganda or the six—one billion five hundred millionths of the world's people who wish to prevent it more than all others.

The cause of Socialism demands that we stand shoulder to shoulder. When we have union we may decide what to do with the leaders who do not lead. It would be galling to have to remain in our party if union should not be effected. Let us take our lesson as nobly as the S. L. P. took theirs—overthrew their schemes and come forth free men. And as De Leonism is ever rampant so on our part 10,000 of us, eternal vigilance is the price of not only our liberty but, perhaps, that of the proletariat, for through the S. D. P. and the S. L. P. must come the co-operative commonwealth. If we flinch we are worse than capitalists, for they do not know the truth. We, knowing it, are most degraded if we fail in our duty to ourselves as workingmen and proletariats.

I like the last paragraph of Max Hayes' reply to the Executive Committee's (four-fifths) aspersions:

"There are some people in this world who are bound to have their own way in even the most minute particulars. They will rule or ruin, being incapable of real leadership, a welding together of homogeneous elements. Such a man is Daniel O'Connell. There are others, nevertheless. Hurrah for Socialism in our time!"

Let me add there are some hero worshippers in the S. D. P. who often think themselves the heroes and continue the worship.

T. F. MEADE.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Say Union is Completed

At a joint meeting of branches 2 and 3, Cleveland, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas, In our opinion the executive board instead of furthering the amalgamation of the S. L. P. and S. D. P., has widened the breach by the issuing of the manifesto appearing in the S. D. Herald of April 7.

"We believe the committee as a whole has done its duty to the members of both parties. We further believe that the committee of the S. L. P. are personally in favor of the name Social Democratic party, and it was only fair and just to their constituents that two names be submitted.

"It appears that there have been too much personal feeling and prejudice throughout all the proceedings, and it would be better for all concerned if such affairs were left out.

"Resolved, That we most emphatically protest against the issuing of the manifesto at this time, as the amalgamation is now practically complete. It would now be too late to submit the question of amalgamation to a vote. For in our opinion the rank and file have been in favor of it at the cost of any sacrifice.
Committee."

To Our Connecticut Readers

All unattached Socialists in the state of Connecticut are requested to write Louis Schlaf, 26 Spring street, Rockville, for information concerning the organization of branches.

Southern California, Attention

All Socialists in the seven southern counties of Southern California should now get to work and so far as possible form branches in every voting precinct. To further this end communicate at once with James T. VanRensselaer, 1618 Terman street, Los Angeles, Cal.

One of the new branches reported as organized at Milwaukee last week should have been credited to Sheboygan.

From the Viewpoint of History

Comrades: As a rule, I do not mind abuse—I am accustomed to it. It usually is an indicator of the fact that what I am doing is right, whenever I am abused by either the capitalist press or by the members and papers of the S. L. P. But this is a different case. At the present I am denounced in no small measure by some members of our party who do not fully understand the situation. However, I made it a rule of my life never to be stamped by oratory, never to be coaxed by flattery, nor ever to be intimidated by abuse. In order to be convinced I want plain facts.

Comrades, I do believe I find myself in the position of that Greek who said: "Strike me, but listen to me" Before all things, permit me to say that I have studied the S. L. P. and its methods for many years. In fact, I was compelled to do so, having been a Socialist for many years and at one time the editor of a daily paper which was acknowledged an organ of the S. L. P.

The talk about De Leonism in the S. L. P. is all wrong. De Leonism is simply the synonym of Social Labor Partyism; what is usually called De Leonism was there a long time before they ever heard of De Leon, but it could not speak English. I will admit though that Professor De Leon, having more ability than the average S. L. P. leader, brought some method into the madness.

To begin with, the S. L. P. is not a political party, never was one and never can be one—it is simply a political sect that adopted Marx's book "Das Kapital" as its bible. And a bible not in the modern, but in old medieval sense, when few people could read it. "Das Kapital" is a book written in a foreign language—only the first volume was ever translated into English, and even the original is written in a language foreign to the average German. The reading of "Das Kapital" presupposes either an academic education or very hard application. In all my experience with the S. L. P., where every man constantly talks about Karl Marx as if he had attended school with him, I only found two or three men who had really read "Das Kapital" and talked about it understandingly. Two of these men are in our party now.

And to the fact that Marx's book is used as fetish rather than an economic work, is partly due that Social Labor Partyism is and always was the caricature of Marxism; and I want it understood that even pure Marxism has not in all things stood the test of time and experience.

To the average S. L. P. man Marx's work is a book with seven seals. Still, the first thing the S. L. P. always accomplished was to give its members a fearfully magnified idea of their importance and "science." They learn a few phrases about exploitation, surplus value, the great revolution and especially about "class-consciousness," repeat them on every occasion, and call that science. In that way the most ignorant of men becomes a "scientific Socialist" in one evening, without having the inconvenience of studying books and thinking about social problems.

The rest of their tactics can be told in a very few words. It is to denounce and vilify everybody who does not entirely agree with them. A man who does not belong to the S. L. P. is in their eyes either a very ignorant person, even if he be a university professor, or he is a scoundrel. Especially do they say this of every reformer, labor leader, or Socialist who has not joined them—of the S. D. P. they have claimed innumerable times that it was a "middle-class party," founded and kept up by the capitalists.

With such conditions it is natural enough that the S. L. P.s watch each other very closely and that every member is a spy upon all the rest. It is enough to see a member shake hands with a government official who is his neighbor, or to bid "Good morning" to a man he has known from childhood, but who is running on the ticket of a capitalist party, to be considered a traitor and a man "who has sold out." The consequence is that every S. L. P. member, no matter how highly he stands in the eyes of his comrades, is sooner or later considered a renegade by his companions unless he dies young—I mean young as a party member.

In short, their tactics are based upon fanaticism, but fanaticism and falsehood being twin-brothers, there is probably no other political organization where more untruth is told about opponents than in the S. L. P.

The main business transacted by the S. L. P. sections (before De Leon's time or after) was not the propaganda of Socialism. Their main business was to fight other Socialists who held opinions different from those in vogue in the S. L. P. or of whom the S. L. P. leaders were jealous. They took especially good care to kill off Socialist papers that they could not fully and absolutely control. Besides papers of small importance the S. L. P. has during the last decade ruined four daily Socialist newspapers.

The result? The S. L. P. became the great stumbling block in the way of progress of Socialism in this country. The S. L. P. is probably not stronger today than it was twenty years ago, although both sides, the De Leonites

as well as the Volkzeitung wing, claim 82,000 votes, most of which they received because there was no other Socialist party in the field. In itself the S. L. P. has been most barren and impotent. It has produced not one man—outside of Daniel De Leon—who is in any way above the most common mediocrity; still, it has besmirched and vilified every labor leader and reformer who has appeared during the last thirty years from Swinton to Debs and Jones of Toledo.

The ideal of the S. L. P.—provided it has any ideals—seems to be a communistic state controlled by hierarchy; something of the kind the Jesuit Fathers had in Paraguay more than 100 years ago. It was a state where everybody had enough to eat and where all had the same elementary education and where all worked in common—but where all independent thinking ceased, the Jesuit Fathers thinking for them all. The result was that life there became so dull that even the propagation of the race ceased to a large extent, although the rulers put up a price for every child that was born. And I may say for myself that if I thought for one moment that the methods and principles of the S. L. P. had any show at all in this country I would direct my last drop of blood in fighting them, for I would rather live under the despotism of the emperor of Russia.

But some may say, Well, all these things have been true of the old S. L. P., but things have changed since the great "Revolution of July 10, 1899," when they dethroned Daniel De Leon. Let's see.

Was that great revolution—it took three Tammany policemen to quench it—really brought about by a change in the methods, principles or tactics in the S. L. P.?

Nothing of the kind. Professor Daniel De Leon, the last generally acknowledged pope of the S. L. P., wanted to get a hold of the typesetting machines and the press of the New York Volkzeitung in order to publish a daily People. It is only natural that the Volkzeitung's editors defended their means of "production and distribution," and being pressed very hard, they tried the same "coup d'etat" on Daniel De Leon and his executive board they did ten years before in 1889. But they forgot one thing. In 1889 they had peaceable Germans to fight, who were not prepared for war. But this time they got hold of the wrong fellow. Dan was prepared, and when the Volkzeitung's crowd came to commit the "revolution," they found a picked lot of Irishmen and Americans to receive them. Dan made short work of the Volkzeitung-Garde, and the only fruit of the great revolution for the Volkzeitung is the capture of the Labor Lyceum Saloon. Not only this. Daniel De Leon beat them in the courts. He got the party name and the party emblem. And what's worse, he also beat them at the following state election; his party receiving about as many votes without the Volkzeitung's crowd as formerly with them.

And the New York Volkzeitung having lost the party and their prestige began to look out for a "new home." It is generally admitted that not one of them thought of fusion with the S. D. P. before. It is also generally understood that had the Volkzeitung party won the S. L. P. name and the S. L. P. emblem in the state of New York and in other states, that there would have been no fusion. But having no party name and a questionable following, they directed their efforts toward our party. Now, if there really had been a change of heart and of tactics in the S. L. P., and if they meant to advance the cause of Socialist unity, then was the time to come right straight over to our side and join our party. But that wasn't the S. L. P. way. Instead of joining us, they tried to capture us. They tried to destroy our organization and to start a new sect with the old spirit under a new name.

The rest you know. And now you will also understand the course of the older Social Democrats and of the executive board. Certainly we wanted a "union of Socialist forces"—although the cry of "union of the reform forces" has destroyed the People's party in 1896—but we wanted a union that would wipe S. L. P.ism off the earth. We did not want to infuse any poison into our young party, and in that sense we clung so tenaciously to the name of the Social Democratic party. We wanted everything that we thought we could use as a shield against the injection of S. L. P. ways and S. L. P. methods. But on the other hand, I must admit the name itself is in no way a panacea against the old evils if the spirit of the S. L. P. is to dominate the Social Democratic party.

In conclusion, the way all negotiations have been conducted by the S. L. P. is a fresh confirmation of the old tactics and spirit. The leopard has not changed its spots. Will Social Democrats give them a majority vote on false pretenses and broken pledges? I hope not. Fusion now carries with it the germs of future dissensions. For your own sake and for the sake of Socialism I implore you to vote "no." Let all tall men of the S. D. P. now stand erect!

Victor L. Berger.

Organize a Branch in Your Town

TO ILLINOIS SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

In accordance with a resolution passed on April 11, 1900, by the Chicago Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party, you are hereby notified that there will be held a convention of the Social Democratic Party of Illinois, for the purpose of nominating the following state officers, to be voted for on Tuesday, Nov. 6, 1900: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor of Public Accounts, Attorney General, State Treasurer, Three Trustees of the Illinois State University, also 24 Presidential Electors, and other officers.

This convention will meet at No. 594 East 63d Street, Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, May 13, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. The representation of said convention will be by delegates chosen as follows:

First.—Each branch shall be entitled to as many representatives as there are individual members in good standing, any representative if selected shall be entitled to one (1) vote for each member whose name is signed to his credential; and provided further, that no member shall sign his name to more than one credential.

Second.—Branches not sending their own representatives may select those of other branches of this state to represent them; provided that in each case the representative shall hold the proper credential with the signature of members attached as herein provided.

Third.—No member shall be qualified to serve as representative or entitled to representation who has not been a member of the Party at least thirty (30) days prior to the opening day of the convention.

Fourth.—All signatures of members attached to credentials, as herein provided, shall be certified to by the chairman or secretary of their respective branches.

J. H. GREER,

Chairman.

CHAS. H. SOELKE,

Secretary.

H. H. FROELICH, PHILIP BROWN, WM. C. HORGAN, SEYMOUR STEDMAN,

Special Committee of the City Central Committee.

From New York

Comrades:—No greater surprise could have come than that brought by "the manifesto."

A howl of dissatisfaction will surely go up, in answer to this statement of our National Executive Board. It appears to be De Leonism over again, for what on earth could have possessed our N. E. B. to publish all this manifesto in support of a minority report before having submitted the majority report! Is this fair?

Further, you state that Mr. G. Benham stated at the conference of March 9th that he would support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes were accepted by our party as candidates. Were these two accepted as candidates by our party? And as they were not, did Benham break any compact? Then again you state that Comrades Harriman, Hayes and Helquit entered into a solemn compact at a conference held at the Occidental Hotel, Indianapolis. In what way did this bind any of these? Was it a conference ordered by the then existing conference or merely a conference of a few members assembled to talk matters over? And as to Comrade J. Harriman having told Comrade Stedman that he would support the name, should a statement not made on the floor of the convention be taken as official?

Now I shall drop this to take up the matter of the conference in New York city, having been present the whole time. Comrade Berger (as you are aware) did not attend the conference. Comrade Heath remained through the Sunday, even taking part in the debate as to name, and it was not until late on Monday that he withdrew. If he considered that the S. L. P. delegates were not acting in good faith, why did he not make this public on Sunday afternoon instead of waiting until 7 p. m. Sunday evening, and then calling upon the chairman for the committee to go into executive session and there create a rumpus? Was he afraid of publicity, or what could have been his intentions?

Did Stedman get hot under the collar because Chicago was not accepted as desired by him for national headquarters? It certainly seemed so, for it was after this that he began to denounce the action of the S. L. P. delegates. (I would relate here that on the first vote for national headquarters Comrade Stedman was the only one to vote for Chicago, even Comrade Haile did not vote for it on the first vote.) From my observation as an onlooker at this convention I feel bound to state that the account in our organ (S. D. Herald) of the opposition delegates is outrageous, for positively no one there could have acted more fairly than Comrades Benham, Hayes and Harriman. Between Comrades Hilquit and Stedman lawyers' battles were carried on, always questions and cross-questions; of course this is only what one might expect.

Now, comrades, I wish to state that New York desires union regardless of

LOCAL BRANCHES

Notices of Branch Meetings Inserted for 25 Cents per Month

CALIFORNIA

Liberty Branch, San Francisco, holds public meetings every Sunday and Wednesday evenings, commencing at 8. Admission free. Educational meetings (for members) every Tuesday evening. Sociology, Economics, Public Speaking, etc. Business meetings (for members) every Thursday evening, with advantage of Educational Course and Social Democratic Herald free to each member, 25 cents per month. Apply to the secretary, John C. Wesley, 117 Turk street.

Branch No. 1, Los Angeles, meets every Sunday afternoon at 8 o'clock at Woodmen's Hall, 1254 Spring St. J. Franco, 700 Dayton Ave., Secretary. Branch No. 5, Alameda, California, holds free public meetings every 2d and 4th Sunday, 8 p. m. at Foresters' Hall, cor Park St. and Santa Clara Ave. Business and Educational meetings (for members) 1st and 3rd Mondays, 8 p. m., at 2405 Colvale Ave. Allan A. Crockett, Secretary, 1810 Walnut St.

COLORADO

Branch No. 1, Denver, meets every Sunday at 8:00 p. m. at 1715 California Ave., Chas. M. Davis, Secretary, 1629 17th Street.

CONNECTICUT

The Connecticut State Committee meets the last Sunday of each month at Turn Hall, Rockville. L. Schlar, Secretary.

Branch No. 3, New Haven, meets every Tuesday evening, at 193 State St., at 8 p. m. Cornelius Mahoney, Secretary, 165 Frank St.

Branch No. 4, Rocky Hill, Conn., meets first and third Thursdays at Turn Hall meeting room, Village street. Secretary, Richard Niederwieser, Box 160.

ILLINOIS

Meetings of Chicago Central Committee held regularly second and third Wednesdays of each month at Dr. J. H. Greer's office, 52 Dearborn Building.

Branch No. 1, Chicago, meets every Wednesday evening. Thomas Kirwin, Secretary, 2604 Wentworth Ave.

Branch No. 3 (Bohemian), Chicago, meets second and fourth Sundays at 2 p. m. at Nagle's Hall, 635 Blue Island Ave. Vaclav Jelinek, Secretary, 605 Blue Island Ave.

Branch No. 3 (Bohemian), Chicago, meets second and fourth Mondays at 8 p. m. at Dunder's place, 1080 W. 18th place. Joseph Dunder, Secretary.

Branch No. 5, Chicago, meets second and fourth Sundays of each month at Andr. Muzik's, 40 Spring St. Paul Chlapka, Secretary, 304 Babie St.

Branch No. 6 (German), Chicago, meets every first Saturday each month at 8 o'clock at Nagle's Hall, 635 Blue Island Ave., near 18th St. Albin Grotz, Secretary, 728 W. 20th St.

Branch No. 9, Chicago, meets at 1145 W. 63rd st., first and third Sundays at 3 p. m. S. L. Westine, Secretary, 6243 Center ave.

INDIANA

Branch No. 6, Indianapolis, meets first Saturday evening and third Sunday afternoon of each month at Reichwein's Hall, corner Market and Noble Sts.

IOWA

Branch No. 2, Hittman, meets every fourth Friday in the month at opera house. B. B. Jamieson, chairman. James Fisher, organizer; Joseph Schollaut, secretary.

KENTUCKY

Branch No. 2, Covington, meets first and third Wednesday evenings and second and fourth Sunday afternoons each month. All attendance meetings except third meeting in month. Good speakers. Secretary, F. C. Stumpf, 201 8th street.

MARYLAND

Branch No. 1, Baltimore, meets every Sunday at 8 p. m. at Carpenter's Hall, 606 E. Baltimore St. Public invited. 728 W. 20th St.

Branch No. 2, Baltimore, meets every Tuesday at 8 p. m. at Wenzel's Hotel, 328 W. Camden st. Good speakers. Public invited. Levin T. Jones, Secretary, 202 W. Harre st.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Massachusetts State Committee meets the first Saturday of each month at 724 Washington St., Boston. All dues and moneys intended for the State Committee should be sent to the financial secretary, A. McDonald, 104 W. Springfield St., Boston. All other correspondence should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Margaret Halle, 5 Glenwood St., Roxbury.

Branch No. 2, Holyoke, meets second and fourth Mondays of each month at Springdale Turner Hall. H. Schlichting, Organizer 587, Sumner St. Branch No. 5, Lynn, permanent headquarters, 171 Munroe St. Business meeting every Monday night at 7:30. Open house. Public invited. Harry Gotimer, Sec., 423 Essex St.

Branch No. 8, Brockton, meets the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month at 8 p. m. for business at Socialist Hall, Clark's Block, corner Main and Center Sts. Every comrade is expected to attend one meeting a month. Frank S. Walsh, Secretary, 62 Crescent St.

Branch No. 15, East Boston, meets every Monday at 8 p. m. at 99 Chelsea St. Miss Jenny Segal, Secretary, 99 Chelsea St.

Branch No. 18, Newburyport, meets the second Monday of each month at Laeter's Hall, 1 State St. T. H. Chinnell, Secretary, 16 Collins St. A. L. Binley, 288 Merrimac St.

Branch No. 21, Chelsea, permanent headquarters, Room 2, Postoffice Building. Open every evening. Business meetings every Thursday at 8 p. m. Public invited.

name, and everywhere that the facts of the case will be presented union will be demanded. The progressive element in this city want unity and this alone. We have worked just as hard for the party (S. D. P.) as our N. E. C. Some of our members have become old men working for the movement, and even they demand union regardless of cost. If we will bear in mind the principles for which we are fighting and not be carried away by false ideas of party we will the sooner improve our condition, politically and socially.

George Finger.

New York City.

NEW BRANCHES

The new branches of the Social Democratic party organized since a week ago, are located at Del Mar, California. Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Van Buren, Arkansas.

Michigan Socialists

All Social Democrats and all unattached Socialists residing in Michigan are requested to write at once to Henry Ramsey, 84 Railroad street, Battle Creek, Mich., and thus aid in placing a Social Democratic state ticket in the field this fall.

To Texas Socialists

For purpose of State organization, the Bonham Social Democratic Branch requests that every Socialist in Texas who reads this notice, will please send name and address to the undersigned. Please attend to this at once. W. E. Farmer, Bonham, Texas.

All Socialist papers please publish.

Oregon Socialists, Attention

You are requested to communicate with J. D. Stevens, Box 204, Portland, organizer for the S. D. P., with a view to instituting branches of the party in your community. The future belongs to Socialism. Lend a hand and get your state thoroughly organized.

MINNESOTA

Branch 1, Red Lake Falls, meets every other Sunday in real estate office of Fred Gasswein, on Main St. A. Kingsbury, Secretary.

MISSOURI

St. Louis headquarters, Room 7, 23 N. Fourth St. Address all communications to E. Val Putnam, Secretary. For information concerning ward branches, inquire at the above address. Branch No. 7, Kansas City, meets every Tuesday at 8 p. m. at 129 Union Ave. G. J. Storz, Secretary, 1230 W. 8th St.

MONTANA

Branch No. 2, meets first and third Sundays of each month at G. W. Wood's home, Chico, Mont.

NEW JERSEY

Branch No. 1, Secretary, Michael W. Schor, 57 Livingston st. Branch No. 5, Camden, N. J., meets every 2d Sunday of the month. For particulars address Paul Eberding, 1206 Kaighn's Avenue.

Branch No. 6 (German), Paterson, N. J., meets first and third Mondays at 8 p. m. at Helvetia Hall, 566 an Houten St. Karl Linder, Secretary, 246 Edmond St.

NEW YORK

The City Central Agitation Committee of Greater New York and vicinity meets first and third Tuesdays of every month in Willsig's Hall, 85 E. 4th St. Elizabeth H. Thomas, Secretary.

Branch No. 1, New York, meets every first and third Thursdays at 8 p. m. at Clinton St. A. Guyer, Secretary, 163 Suffolk St.

Branch No. 3, 24th Assembly District, meets second and fourth Wednesdays of the month at 1059 Second Ave., at the "Central." Henry Lang, Secretary, 324 E. 60th St.

Branch No. 4, West Side Branch, New York, meets second and fourth Tuesdays of every month at headquarters, 1 W. 99th St. Elizabeth H. Thomas, Secretary.

Branch No. 5 Brooklyn, New York, meets every Saturday at 8 p. m. at 56 Moore St. Visitors welcome. Comrades meeting for organization should communicate with Secretary Sol. Pressman, 190 Boerum St.

Branch No. 10, 4th Assembly District, meets every first and third Wednesday of the month in the rooms of The Voice of Labor, 428 Grand St. Jacob Panken, Organizer, 125 Division St.

Branch No. 12, Brooklyn, headquarters, 251 Rutledge St. Meets every third Thursday at 8:15 sharp. All persons interested are invited to attend these meetings and co-operate in organizing local branches in every district in the city. Wm. Butcher, Secretary, 251 Rutledge St.

Branch No. 20, regular meetings are held first and third Friday of the month, at Webster Hall, 160th St. and Third Ave. Borough of the Bronx, E. Spranger, Secretary, 317 E. 149th St. All persons interested in Socialism and the S. D. P. are invited to attend.

OHIO

Branch No. 2, Cleveland, meets in Ohlsen's Hall, 6 York St., second and fourth Sundays at 3 p. m. Lectures, discussions, business meetings, first and third Fridays at 8 p. m.

Branch No. 3, Cleveland, meets first and third Sundays in each month at 8 p. m. in Ohlsen's Hall, 6 York St. Lectures and discussions.

Branch No. 4, Cincinnati, meets at Richelieu Hall southeast corner 9th and Plum Sts., every Sunday at 2 p. m. Lectures and discussions. Public invited. Jos. Adams, Secretary, 140 Central Ave.

Branch No. 5, Dayton, Ohio, meets every 2d and 4th Friday evening, in Hall 27, Central Trades Council C. Schave, Chairman, W. Barringer, Secretary, P. O. Box 294.

Branch No. 8, Cincinnati, meets every second and fourth Saturday in Workingmen's Hall, 1213 Walnut St. F. Hamel, Secretary, 1213 Walnut St.

Branch No. 11, German, Columbus. Ed Greiner, Secretary, 806 Mohawk St.

PENNSYLVANIA

Branch No. 2, Erie, meets every Sunday, 3 p. m., at K. of L. Hall, 716 State St. Chairman, Joseph Stain, Secretary, J. E. Perry, 119 Sassafras St.

Branch No. 4, Pittsburg, meets every Thursday evening at 7:30 p. m. at Funk Hall, 8 3/4th and Josephine Sts. W. Bohm, President, 544 Addison St. J. H. Lewis, Secretary, 2318 Jane St.

Branch No. 5 (Jewish), Philadelphia, meets every Friday at 4:30 P. M. Discussion from 8 to 9. I. Carson, Secretary.

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee Central Committee meets on the first Monday of each month at 8 p. m. sharp at 10 E. Water St. Eugene H. Rooney, Secretary. John Dorr, Treasurer.

Branch No. 1, Milwaukee, meets every second and fourth Tuesday evening of the month at the Ethical Society Building, 638 Jefferson St. Meetings always discussions. Howard Tuttle, Chairman. Eugene H. Rooney, Secretary.

Branch No. 2, Milwaukee, meets every second and fourth Friday in Geatke's Hall, corner Green Bay and Concordia Ave.

Branch No. 3, Sheboygan, meets every fourth Thursday of the month at Gustav Burgard's Hall on Pennsylvania Ave. R. Schoen, Secretary, 225 Superior, S. 12th St.

Branch No. 4, Milwaukee, meets every first and third Friday each month at Meller's Hall, corner 23d and Brown Sts. George Moerschel, Secretary, 391 25th St.

Branch No. 9, Milwaukee, meets every fourth Friday of the month at R. Sigel's Hall, southeast corner Orchard St. and 9th Ave. O. Wild, Secretary.

Branch No. 11, Milwaukee, meets the second Wednesday of each month at the office of the Wisconsin Vorwaerts, 614 State St.

Branch No. 12, Milwaukee, meets every first and third Thursday of each month at Kraus' Hall, 21 and Center St., at 8 p. m. Secretary, Rudolph Loeschman, 1126 23rd St.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LIBRARY

Table listing books and pamphlets with prices, including Karl Marx, Capital, Cloth \$6.00; F. W. Sprague—Socialism, from Genesis to Revelation, Cloth, 1.00; Gronlund—The Co-operative Commonwealth, 1.00; Paper, .50; August Bebel—Woman: Past, Present and Future, .25; Blachford—Merrie England, .10; Edward Bellamy—Looking Backward, .10; Edward Bellamy—Equality, Cloth, 1.25; Lisagary—History of the Commune of 1871, 1.00; Adams—Wall—Modern Socialism, 1.00; Asplund—Heterodox Economics, 1.00; Profits, .15; Henry D. Lloyd—Wealth Against Common Wealth, 1.00; Fols—The Ruins of Empires, .25; Thomas Paine—The Rights of Man, .25; Henry George—Social Problems, .25; Osborne—The Ancient Lowly, 1.50; Adams—President John Smith, .25; Richard T. Ely—Socialism and Social Reform, 1.50; Buchner—Man in the Past, Present and Future, 1.00; Besnham—A History of the Paris Commune 1871 (cloth 75c), paper cover, .25; Chas. H. Vail—Principles of Scientific Socialism, .25; Heron—Between Jesus and Caesar, .40; Fabian Essays, .25; Rogers—Six Centuries of Work and Wages, .25; Paine—Rights of Man, .25; Donnelly—Caesar's Column, .25.

PAMPHLETS

Table listing pamphlets with prices, including F. G. R. Gordon—Hard Times: Cause and Cure, .05; Leonard D. Abbott—The Society of the Future, .05; F. Lassalle—What is Capital, .05; H. M. Hyndman—Socialism and Slavery, .05; F. Lassalle—The Workingman's Program, .10; Chas. H. Vail—The Industrial Revolution, .05; 1000 copies, \$2.00; 500 copies, 1.25; 250 copies, .75; 100 copies, .35.

THEODORE DEBS, Secretary Treasurer, 126 Washington Street, Chicago.

The Social Democratic Red Book

PRICE 15 CENTS

Sent postpaid on receipt of price

Debs Publishing Co. TERRE HAUTE, IND.

BRANCH SUPPLIES

Table listing branch supplies with prices: Charters \$2.00; Membership Cards (per 100) 1.00; Membership Applications (100) .25; Constitutions (each) .03.

Send orders with cash to Theodore Debs, 126 Washington Street, Chicago. No supplies sent on credit.

Views of a Committeeman

As one of the members of the committee on union I desire in behalf of myself as such, to lay before the comrades of the S. D. P. certain facts in relation to the New York conference, and at the same time in language as strong as I possibly can to repudiate some of the statements made in the manifesto issued by the N. E. Board in the Herald, as well as the one great motive back of all the prevention of Socialist unity.

It is a positive fact that some of the N. E. Board were strongly opposed to a unification of the S. L. P. and S. D. P., and were it not for the overwhelming majority and sentiment of the delegates at the convention who came instructed to work for union, negotiations to that effect would have been prevented at that time.

In the first place, I wish to censure the N. E. Board for exceeding their authority by publishing any such manifesto previous to receiving report of the committee together with their side of the case, and thereby endeavoring to prejudice the minds of the comrades throughout the country as to the exact state of affairs, so that when the report is sent to the branches to be voted on, the comrades will be ready to overthrow our earnest and sincere efforts to secure an honorable union without understanding the whole situation.

The convention at Indianapolis elected a committee of nine to confer with the committee from the S. L. P. to arrange a plan for union of the two parties; until such report had been placed before the membership, I again reiterate that the N. E. Board had no jurisdiction in the matter. The membership, through its delegates at Indianapolis, evidently had enough faith in the comrades elected to consummate a union to believe that not one step would be retracted from what they considered right and just; and nothing was done at that conference which does not clearly show that the comrades who sat for three long, weary days and nights hard at work on the many intricate questions were persons of broadest mind and character, who held the principles of Socialism high above anything else in connection with our movement.

One thing is to be regretted, however; the two members of your committee on union who affixed their names to the manifesto took no part in the proceedings at the conference and violated the great trust given to them by the Indianapolis convention. Comrade Berger did not come at all, claiming sickness at home; but had he been anxious to have our full quota at the conference a telegram sent to the secretary of our committee at the time his co-delegate, Comrade Heath, left Milwaukee, would have been ample time to have telegraphed to the comrade who received the next highest vote, requesting him to attend in place of Comrade Berger.

Then there is Comrade Heath, who, after sitting with the conference all day Sunday, March 25th, hearing and taking part in the preliminary discussion, refused to act any longer in conjunction with your committee, after we had unanimously agreed (even Comrade Stedman, who also signed the manifesto) to submit two names to a referendum vote. The manifesto clearly states that the conference committee of eighteen failed in performing its true work in two salient points, viz., in regard to name, and secondly, regarding the referendum on the name.

In relation to the first point let me state that according to the instructions passed at the convention, which, by the way, was the minority report, that we urge the name Social Democratic Party. This your committee did with all the argument and oratory at their command, the debate on that question lasting all day Sunday; but both committees were of a steadfast opinion, and all the argument from now till doomsday could not have convinced our S. L. P. friends on the committee that our name was the best.

Therefore, after one whole day of earnest and hard work, it was decided that each committee should hold a separate meeting and discuss the question of name. This was done; your committee adjourning to the Occidental Hotel, where the whole thing was thrashed over again until midnight, when it was decided that we submit the name Social Democratic Party and let the S. L. P. committee submit a name if they chose to.

Right here I will state that Comrade Stedman was in favor of the proposition and agreed heartily with your committee on this point, I can't understand how he has come to the conclusion to sign the manifesto just issued.

The National Executive Board is trying to show up your committee as having violated its trust by allowing the question of name to be settled by a majority vote of both parties.

I must deny that statement, for in the report you will see that simply as a provision, not to have unity overthrow in case a concurrent majority vote fails, we have submitted the following proposition: "Are you in favor of a majority vote of both parties deciding the question of name in case the vote fails to receive a concurrent majority of both parties?"

This question now being referred to the membership of both parties for settlement, who shall say that the democratic principle of allowing the membership to decide this question is not proper and just?

Let the comrades understand that if a concurrent majority fails on the question of name, all negotiations are off, unity is buried, and the hopes of a united movement are blown away like chaff before the wind.

From what I have been able to learn, had some of our learned comrades used better judgment, tactics and the proper spirit since the convention, the name Social Democratic Party, although perhaps failing to receive the concurrent majority vote, would positively have received a large enough majority on a joint vote to insure the name of the united movement being the Social Democratic Party; even now it is not too late if our comrades use the proper judgment.

Such action as that displayed in the manifesto is not going to gain votes for our name, but to the contrary, is doing it a positive injury.

As to what took place at the hotel in Indianapolis, the statements of Comrades Edwards and Gordon are true (as I was present at that meeting) with but one exception, and that is the statement of Comrade Benham.

I deny that Comrade Benham made any promise whatever, but, to the contrary, would not take any definite stand; stating that the rest of the committee, referring to Comrades Harriman and Hilquit, could promise what they saw fit, but he (Benham) would not stand for any promises, and would not be bound by anything they said. He gave no personal pledge, which I am sure Comrades Chase, Marely, Carey, Martin and others who were present, will corroborate if interviewed on this point.

Therefore it is bad policy and dangerous for any person to swear to an affidavit if he is not perfectly sure that his statements in such affidavit are absolutely correct.

Now as to the pledges made by Comrades Harriman and Hilquit, will state that after they had promised their moral support to work for the name S. D. Party, with the understanding that that was to be an argument to be used by Comrade Berger in influencing Comrade Debs to accept the nomination. But immediately upon leaving the room we were confronted by Comrades McCartney, Haile and Thomas, who advised us of the acceptance of the nomination by Comrade Debs.

This news coming immediately after leaving the conference where Comrade Berger stated it would take him possibly two hours to convince Comrade Debs to accept, was received with alarm, not only by the S. L. P. members of the conference, but by some of the S. D. P. comrades, who immediately inquired whether the whole thing was a put up job to get the S. L. P. delegates to agree to stand by our name; after explanation all present were satisfied that it was not.

Therefore as the compact was made to influence Comrade Debs to accept and as he had already accepted while we were making the agreement in our room, the S. L. P. delegates did not consider their promises binding whatever.

Where the mistake was made was in the conference not meeting again at 11:30 that evening as agreed upon, when the matter could have been settled then and there.

The whole affair was a misunderstanding between the two committees, and when properly explained to your committee on union they were satisfied to continue negotiations.

Another statement to be repudiated is the one referring to Comrade Hayes' action at the conference. While I do not remember at this moment whether he did or did not speak in favor of the name "S. D. P.," I will positively state that he did vote for the name "Social Democratic Party," and was the only one on the committee from the other side who voted with us. He broke no pledges, and stood by what he said at the Indianapolis convention. It is therefore very unjust for our National Executive Board to publicly make such a statement against Comrade Hayes.

What an enormous blunder and what a discredit is heaped upon the N. E. Board when they openly state that the S. L. P. comrades are likely to hand in a fictitious vote. This is an open insult to every member of the S. L. P., and I, for one, shall not stand for it. I am convinced that the S. L. P. comrades are just as good, honest, sincere, earnest and devoted to the principles of Socialism as are the Social Democrats. Therefore, let those people who "live in glass houses" refrain from throwing stones at others.

Two more points and I am done. One is the antagonistic spirit in which the manifesto is written, referring to our choice for the vice-presidency, Comrade Job Harriman, as "Mr." (and also Comrade Benham), when we should at least address such earnest workers in the Socialist cause as "Comrades." And finally, no better argument could have been presented by any comrade that Chicago is not the place where the Executive Board of the unity party shall have its headquarters than the spirit and antagonism shown in the issue of this manifesto.

Union is desirable. Union is wanted and union will be accomplished, although a few who think they control this movement can try to sidetrack it by bringing forth their personal enmities.

The Socialists of this country will no longer tolerate a handful of men to dictate to them what they shall do, but are intelligent enough and understand fully well what is the best step to be taken for the advancement of the cause of Socialism. Our Executive Board asks is union desirable? when in the city of Chicago the S. D. P. and S. L. P. have united in the campaign just closed under the name S. L. P. Milwaukee also united in the campaign just closed under the name S. D. P. Other places like Cleveland, Ohio, and Newark, N. J., are now in campaign united. The New York State agitation committee is working in unison with the S. L. P., while in many places throughout the country the branches of both parties are carrying on together their work of agitation.

This explanation of the true facts in the case is not handed out with any other spirit than that of a true and sincere Socialist and to show the comrades of the S. D. P. the position taken by your committee on union and that taken by your National Executive Board. Truly said, you are the arbiters; and I for one have enough confidence in my comrades to know that the proper stand will be taken by them, and those who are in the wrong will be most severely criticized and censured as the case warrants it.

WM. BUTSCHER.

The Situation

Comrades: There is nothing in a name. A name "should not stand in the way of Socialist unity." Those are the phrases we hear now often from members of the S. L. P., and from some of our own comrades, who are ready to sacrifice our name for unity's sake. Many arguments were given for the name, Social Democratic Party, and the best I heard were certainly J. Carey's, at our last meeting, but there is still some vacancy left, which I intend partly to fill out. If a name should not stand in the way of union, why do the S. L. P. comrades make such a fight for the change of it? If our party would have made our name a condition sine qua non, as the majority report on the name question wanted, there could have been some dissatisfaction from the S. L. P. comrades. They could say that it was humiliating for them to accept such conditions. But, although instructed by their constituents to do so, our delegates to the Indianapolis convention showed good judgment and accepted the minority report, extending by that a brotherly hand to the organization of the S. L. P. We all expected that the S. L. P. comrades would now take the second step towards us, show that they grasped the situation, and would drop all discussions about the name. Whether the members of the S. L. P. committee did promise or did not to work for our name, they could clearly understand that the rank and file of our party could not be induced to change the party name; they could understand that the acceptance of the minority report was on "a form," a diplomatic way of not offending the S. L. P. comrades and in the same time pressing our point. I do not know what kind of "deals" have been made about the names and candidates, in what words the promises were made or not made; one thing is clear to everyone—the members of the S. L. P. conference committee created the impression that they would work for our name, and as a proof that they tried it we can cite the fact that their own New York comrades met them with great dissatisfaction. The three members of the S. L. P. conference committee (I understand that Max Hayes kept his word and cast his vote against the name U. S. P.), certainly deserve a great deal of criticism. Even if their constituency showed dissatisfaction with their stand, they should have kept up the impression they had made on our convention and rather resign from the committee than be conscious of having acted, not like men, but like diplomats and politicians in the capitalist sense of these words.

But whatever name their action deserves, the Social Democratic Party has nothing to tremble for. I have entire faith in the good judgment of our comrades to have voted for our party name, to have voted down point 3, and also cast a big "No" against the most anarchistic plan of conducting the press affair of a party that ever came to my knowledge.

The common sense of the rank and file would have brought the whole situation to a satisfactory one. But, alas! The members of the party propose and the executive committee disposes. Here comes the great mistake of all executive committees. They always have too little confidence in the rank and file and are always inclined to too much "leading" instead of "following." I think that the referendum proposed by our executive committee is, mildly expressed, a step in the wrong direction; that it makes the situation more complicated than ever, and that many a faithful comrade, who stands with his whole soul for Socialism and for our party, will feel that a great mistake has been made.

Because a few members of the S. L. P. conference committee did not take the stand we had a right to expect from

them to break up a movement for unity, where thousands of simple honest workmen are concerned, who are not very smart in diplomacy, but have a keen sense of righteousness and honesty, would be ridiculous. Our own conference committee did not show the good judgment we expected from them, and after all we are all human and are all liable to make mistakes. But to base a question of unity of Socialist forces on mistakes made by a few personalities would be entirely wrong. To break off our relations with the S. L. P. in such an abrupt manner as our executive committee proposes to us would not prove that we are far-sighted enough to grasp the situation.

Such an action would certainly prevent union, not for years, but for scores of years to come; it would make any new steps towards union almost impossible. But if everything goes the regular way—how different. Let us suppose that both parties vote on the name; our party without doubt voting for ours, the S. L. P. comrades voting for the "United Socialist Party." Such a disagreement would bring the conference committee together, and if they could not unite on one name, there would be no unity, but there would be no bad feeling and union only postponed.

With the referendum proposed by our executive, the situation is very complicated indeed. But never despair. Our party is too strong to be staggered even by harder blows. The way out of it is clear.

I would advise all comrades to vote "yes" on the proposition of the executive, adding at once their vote—

1. For the name Social Democratic Party.

2. Against proposition 3, which advises to accept the majority of both parties as ruling.

3. Against the whole matter about the party press.

This would prove to our executive committee that our party is not in danger and that, although not accepting the path they offer us out of the difficulty, in spirit we ask them and have no doubt that it was only their faithfulness, their deep love for our movement which dictated to them the somewhat hasty action. Mrs. A. Konikow. Boston, Mass.

Democracy and Socialism

Editor the Herald: As to the present name of our party being set aside, and another name adopted, would, I am sure, be a sad case of social suicide. Let us retain our present name, Social Democrat, and not divorce the word democracy from socialism, because we are truly a democratic party. And through its principles we expect to construct the system of Socialism. I love the name because W. J. Bryan and "democrats" so-called do not believe in its principles. It is a name that is invisibly tattooed on every Socialist. If he has not got it, he is not a Socialist. But you may say there is a Democratic party, and we should not lose that name. To that question I would say there is not a Democratic party; there is a party that assumes that name, but its principles are not democratic, neither will they be so, until it is compelled to prolong its life by adopting as a plank direct legislation, which will only be used to inject a feeling into its old supporter.

Let us stand for the name Social Democracy! Marion, Ind. Edward Meyer.

Dissatisfied With Terms

Editor of The Herald: I would like to be informed by what authority and consistency the national executive decided to leave the question of "unity" to a referendum vote, after the delegates with instructions given by a referendum vote of their respective locals unanimously voted for the affirmative of this question at the national convention. I am positively in favor of "unity," although not fully satisfied, with the terms the conference committee proposes.

Hilquit and the rest of the delegates of the S. L. P. may not have kept their promises; but that does not mean to express the traits and sentiments of the whole S. L. P. I know of many comrades of the S. L. P. who are in favor of both the name (S. D. P.) and the seat for the national executive (Chicago).

It is my opinion that instead of speaking against "unity," the national executive ought to have agitated for the adoption of all the good points the joint conference committee proposes, and for the abolition of the bad ones; and thereby have avoided the creation of diametrically opposite opinion in the ranks of the comrades of New York. New York. Samuel B. Fliashnick.

To Our Washington Readers

Comrade D. Burgess of New Whatcom, Wash., has been selected as organizer for the state and is prepared to assist the Socialists of Washington in organizing branches of the S. D. P. Correspondence addressed to him will receive prompt attention.

North Dakota Socialists

Socialists residing in North Dakota and desiring to organize for effective propaganda work in that state are requested to correspond with Math. Eidsness, Towner, N. D.

Pocket Library of Socialism

- 1. Woman and the Social Problem. By MAY WOOD BRADY. Shows the emancipation of women will only come with the emancipation of man through socialism.
2. The Evolution of the Class Struggle. By WILLIAM H. MORLEY. A historical study showing how socialism is coming.
3. Imprudent Marriages. By ROBERT BRADY. A masterly answer to the argument that "justice" would be the laborer.
4. Packingtowns. By A. M. SIMONS. A study of the Union Stock Yards, Chicago; how nature and man are alike scientifically exploited.
5. Realism in Literature and Art. By CLARENCE H. DABROW. Shows how the workers' struggles and literature are helping on the new social order.
6. Single Tax vs. Socialism. By A. M. SIMONS. Shows the inadequacy of the Single Tax as a remedy for the evils pointed out by Henry George.
7. Wage-Labor and Capital. By KARL MARX. The essence of the great philosopher's theory, in his own words.
8. The Man Under the Machine. By A. M. SIMONS. Tells how wage slavery began, what it is today and how the workers are going to free themselves. A condensed handbook of socialism.
9. The Mission of the Working Class. By REV. CHARLES H. VAIL, author of "Modern Socialism."
10. Morals and Socialism. By CHARLES H. VAIL. Shows how popular ideas of morals are manipulated in the interest of the capitalist class.
11. Socialist Songs. Sixteen good ones, fit tunes every one knows.
12. After Capitalism What? By REV. WILLIAM T. BROWN. A logical historical study showing that socialism must come as the result of forces now at work.
13. A Political Quack Doctor. By W. A. COREY. A socialist view of the "Prohibition" movement.
Daintily printed, five cents each, post-paid.

SPECIAL OFFER—For one dollar we will mail forty copies of the Pocket Library, all of one kind or assorted as preferred.

SEND ORDERS TO THEODORE DEBS 126 Washington St., CHICAGO

PRINCIPLES OF Scientific Socialism

By Rev. Charles H. Vail Author "Modern Socialism" and "National Ownership of Railways."

- CONTENTS: The Industrial Revolution. The Analysis of Value. The Origin of Surplus Value. The Advantages of Socialism: Production, Distribution, Elimination of Useless Vocations, Prevention of Waste, Elevation of Woman, Proper Care and Training of Children, Ethical Directors, Solution of the Monetary Question, Abolition of Taxation, Simplification of Government, Benefits to Capitalists, Benefits to Laborers. The Evidence of the Moral Strength of Socialism: Spirit and Aim; Abolition of Business Dishonesty; Restriction of Divorce; Prevention of Prostitution; Elimination of Crime; Prevention of Intemperance, Inequality, etc. Poverty—Its Cause and Cure. Wage Slavery vs. Chattel Slavery. Rent and Interest. The Law of Wages. The Law of Progress. Industrial Depressions and Commercial Crises. The Problem of Labor-Saving Machinery. Popular Economic Errors: That Value is Determined by Capitalist Cost of Production; that the Interests of Laborers and Capitalists are identical; that Labor is Better Off Today Than Ever Before; that Cheap Prices are Beneficial to Labor; that Foreign Markets are Beneficial to Labor; that Luxury is Beneficial to Labor; that Land Nationalization Would Solve the Social Question; that Extraneous is the Chief Cause of Economic Want; that Socialism Would Thwart Inventions and Improvements; that Socialism Would Destroy Individuality. Conclusion and Index. 12mo, 236 Pages; Paper, 35c; Cloth, \$1.00.

SEND ORDERS TO THEODORE DEBS, 126 Washington St. CHICAGO

Headquarters for Literature.

- SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC. 1. Liberty Debs. 5c. 2. Merrile England. Blatchford. 10c. 3. Municipal Socialism. Gordon. 5c. 4. Prison Labor. Debs. 5c. 5. Socialism and Slavery. Hyndman. 5c. 6. Gov'n't Ownership of Railways. Gordon. 5c. 7. Orator on Voltaire. Victor Hugo. 5c. 8. Evolution of Industry. Watkins. 5c. 9. Hard Times. Cause and Cure. Gordon. 5c. 10. Women: Past, Present and Future. Rebel. 5c. 11. The Red Light. Cason. 25c. 12. The Pullman Strike. Carwardine. 5c. 13. Co-Operative Commonwealth. Gordon. 5c. 14. The New Economy. Grounau. \$1.25. MECHANICAL AND ENGINEERING. 15. Progressive Examination of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen. Hill. 5c. 16. Locomotive Running Repairs. Hitchcock. 5c. 17. Simple Lessons in Drawing for the Shop. Reynolds. 5c. 18. Air Brake Practice. Phelan. \$1.00. 19. Ready Reference. Alexander. \$1.50. 20. Locomotive Running and Management. Sinclair. \$2.00. 21. Compound Locomotives. Woods. \$2.00. 22. Twenty Years with the Indicator. Pray. \$2.50. 23. Hand-Book of the Locomotive. Roper. \$2.50. 24. New Catechism of the Locomotive. Fomyer. \$1.50. Note.—Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 in lots of 10 copies, 25 cents; in lots of 100 copies, \$1.50. No. 2 in lots of 10 copies, 50 cents; in lots of 100 copies, \$2.50. Send orders to

DEBS PUBLISHING CO., TERRE HAUTE, IND.

NATIONAL FUND

The following is a list of comrades who have agreed, in response to the appeal of the National Executive Board, to contribute monthly for one year to the national fund. Other names will be added as they are received.

- CONNECTICUT: Finesilver, N. H., Hartford; Holman, B., Hartford. NEW YORK: Fales, I. C., Bensonhurst; Abbott, L. D., New York; Butscher, Wm., Brooklyn; Thomas, E. H., New York; Kahle, Wm., New York; Heis, F. W., New York; Loupolov, Jas., New York; Pankin, J., New York; Weyall, Chas., New York; Mark Raphael, New York; Aaron N. Bodoff, New York; Philip Gruber, New York; Samuel Wm., New York; Meade, T. F., Brooklyn. MASSACHUSETTS: Flanders, P. B., Haverhill; Cohen, A., Boston; Parker, Lew., Newton; Monette, G. C., Brockton; Rosworth, W. P., Brockton; Tate, Peter, Everett; Hitchcock, D. G., Warren; Goldman, S., Haverhill; Hough, E., Newton; Chase, Jno. C., Haverhill; Brown, J. W., Tomolton; Grievens, C. S., Amesbury; Allen, Helen N., Lynn; Keown, Dr. J. A., Lynn; Carey, Jas. F., Haverhill. NEW JERSEY: Pankopf, Carl, Jersey City; Karl Lindner, Paterson; "Comrade," Newark. OHIO: Becvar, Jos., Cleveland; Zorn, Julius, Cleveland; Bryan, F., Cleveland; Altenberndt, C., Cleveland. PENNSYLVANIA: Lewis, J. H., Pittsburgh; F. W. Hirt, ... TENNESSEE: Enloe, Dr. R. H., Nashville; Hamilton, W. A., Nashville; Mahoney, Wm., Nashville. TEXAS: Price, R. S., Houston. WISCONSIN: Berger, V. L., Milwaukee; Rooney, E. H., Milwaukee; Ziegler, E., Milwaukee; Doerfler, John, Milwaukee; Baumgardner, G. S., Milwaukee; Arnold, L., Milwaukee; Meister, B., Milwaukee; Humans, C., Milwaukee; Taidle, R., Milwaukee; Heath, J., Milwaukee; Branch 4, Milwaukee.

The Union Label

on everything you buy is a guarantee that the producer thereof receives a fair rate of wages for his production. Insist on having the label.